

Student Mobility Scholarships

Helping Families Access the Best Schools

BEN DEGROW





The Mackinac Center for Public Policy is a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to improving the quality of life for all Michigan residents by promoting sound solutions to state and local policy questions. The Mackinac Center assists policymakers, scholars, businesspeople, the media and the public by providing objective analysis of Michigan issues. The goal of all Center reports, commentaries and educational programs is to equip Michigan residents and other decision makers to better evaluate policy options. The Mackinac Center for Public Policy is broadening the debate on issues that have for many years been dominated by the belief that government intervention should be the standard solution. Center publications and programs, in contrast, offer an integrated and comprehensive approach that considers:

All Institutions. The Center examines the important role of voluntary associations, communities, businesses and families, as well as government.

All People. Mackinac Center research recognizes the diversity of Michigan residents and treats them as individuals with unique backgrounds, circumstances and goals.

All Disciplines. Center research incorporates the best understanding of economics, science, law, psychology, history and morality, moving beyond mechanical cost-benefit analysis.

All Times. Center research evaluates long-term consequences, not simply short-term impact.

Committed to its independence, the Mackinac Center for Public Policy neither seeks nor accepts any government funding. The Center enjoys the support of foundations, individuals and businesses that share a concern for Michigan's future and recognize the important role of sound ideas. The Center is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. For more information on programs and publications of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, please contact:

Mackinac Center for Public Policy 140 West Main Street P.O. Box 568 Midland, Michigan 48640
989-631-0900 Fax: 989-631-0964 Mackinac.org mcpp@mackinac.org

The Mackinac Center for Public Policy

Student Mobility Scholarships: Helping Families Access the Best Schools

By Ben DeGrow

©2019 by the Mackinac Center for Public Policy
Midland, Michigan



Guarantee of Quality Scholarship

The Mackinac Center for Public Policy is committed to delivering the highest quality and most reliable research on Michigan issues. The Center guarantees that all original factual data are true and correct and that information attributed to other sources is accurately represented.

The Center encourages rigorous critique of its research. If the accuracy of any material fact or reference to an independent source is questioned and brought to the Center's attention with supporting evidence, the Center will respond in writing. If an error exists, it will be noted in a correction that will accompany all subsequent distribution of the publication. This constitutes the complete and final remedy under this guarantee.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Michigan Landscape: School Choice	1
Michigan Landscape: School Transportation	3
Intersection of Choice and Transportation	4
Detroit: Urban Context	5
Beyond Michigan: Advances in School Transportation.....	6
Student-Based Transportation Funding	6
Student Mobility Scholarships: Concept and Law.....	7
Student Eligibility	7
Transportation Options	8
Funding Mechanism	9
A Pilot Program.....	9
Pilot Program Funding	10
Conclusion	11
Endnotes	12

Introduction

Quality education is often seen as a means to achieve greater upward socioeconomic mobility, but in some cases, a different kind of mobility is needed to access that kind of education in the first place. In Michigan's lower-income urban communities, where educational options are most heavily in demand, accessing the most suitable and desired schools is often limited by the availability and affordability of convenient transportation. Michigan could support low-income families' efforts to transport their children to better schools and boost these children's chances for upward socioeconomic mobility by creating Student Mobility Scholarships.

In 2017, then-Rep. Tim Kelly, R-Saginaw Twp., chair of the House school aid appropriations subcommittee, proposed creating a dedicated funding stream to reimburse school districts for providing transportation to low-income students. Charter schools and districts accepting transfer students through Schools of Choice would have been eligible for these reimbursements. But the proposed language was ultimately withdrawn. The idea regained some political support, however, when Bill Schuette, a gubernatorial candidate in the 2018 Michigan election, made the idea of transportation scholarships a part of his policy platform.¹

A transportation scholarship plan is rooted in the idea of providing a more level playing field for Michigan's most economically disadvantaged families. Charter schools and other public school choice programs have expanded opportunities for students to choose different educational settings that serve them better, and these options are especially important for low-income students who make use of them at a disproportionately high rate.

Two obstacles to exercising educational choice are commonly identified: lack of access to meaningful and accurate information on school performance and a lack of affordable, reliable transportation. Student Mobility Scholarships would be designed to make educational choice more equitable by removing that second barrier. It seems particularly fitting that the state once known for its dominant role in the automotive industry could drive this type of innovation forward.

Michigan Landscape: School Choice

Improving access to better educational options for Michigan families first requires understanding what options are currently available. The state's landscape of educational choice highlights why Student Mobility Scholarships could be especially beneficial and effective. The most common method for exercising public school choice is residential mobility. Families with the financial means to do so purchase or rent housing in school districts they believe offer their children better educational opportunities. Historically, families without the means to do likewise did not have any public school options.

Since 1994, Michigan has opened doors to other forms of public school choice. Today nearly 300 public charter schools serve roughly 150,000 students.² These independently governed and often specialized schools operate strictly on the basis of parental choice. No students are assigned to these schools. Families must actively seek out and sign up to enroll. Demand for public education

alternatives is greater in lower-income communities, where school districts appear less likely to adequately meet students' learning needs or live up to parents' expectations. Statewide, three out of four charter students are considered economically disadvantaged, compared to less than half of their peers in district schools.³

Within prescribed limits, Schools of Choice and similar programs further expand educational options for Michigan parents. SOC enables parents to enroll their children in a school in a neighboring district, so long as that neighboring district accepts nonresident students. Most districts participate and enroll students from outside their geographical territory, but there is wide variation among districts in the number of nonresident students they admit.* In 2019, more than 193,000 Michigan students attended a public school in a conventional district outside of the one where they live.⁴ Students who cross district lines to attend school tend to be lower-income and lower-performing on state achievement tests than the typical public school student in Michigan.⁵

Still, surveys of Michigan families who exercise choice have demonstrated that the motivation to access educational options crosses income and geographical lines. Some are motivated by concerns for their child's safety, such as being a victim of bullying or lack of discipline from school leaders. Others seek out certain types of academic programming that they feel serves their children best, while others desire smaller, more intimate schooling environments, such as those offered by independent, single-site charter schools.[†] Some may be attracted to newer models of education, like cyber schools, a type of charter school that delivers most or all of its instruction online. In all, nearly a quarter of Michigan's 1.4 million K-12 students attend a charter school or use some form of interdistrict educational choice.

Unlike parents in dozens of other states, Michiganders cannot make use of public funds to enroll in any type of school except a legally defined public school. A 1970 voter-approved initiative amended Michigan's constitution to prohibit the use of state or local tax funds "directly or indirectly to aid or maintain any private, denominational or other nonpublic, pre-elementary, elementary, or secondary school."⁶ Nevertheless, even without public tuition support, about 112,000 students attended Michigan private schools in 2017, according to the Michigan Department of Education.

* For example, some districts accept only a handful of nonresident students, while several districts enroll more nonresidents than students who live within their boundaries. See: Julie Mack, "The 54 Michigan Districts with Biggest Enrollment Gains from School Choice" (MLive.com, Sept. 3, 2018), <https://perma.cc/E9HK-RNMW>. Based on a 2017 survey, about one-third of the surveyed districts set no limits on how many nonresident students they would enroll, but other districts limit nonresident enrollment to a single program or grade level. Ben DeGrow, "A Survey of Michigan Parents Who Use School Choice" (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Sept. 17, 2017), 3–4, <https://perma.cc/DFV3-M3DF>.

† One in five Michigan charter school parents cited bullying or safety concerns as a primary motivation for leaving their assigned district school. "Choices & Voices" (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Sept. 6, 2018), 7–8, <https://perma.cc/GEN8-W3UJ>.

Michigan Landscape: School Transportation

A 2017 Urban Institute analysis estimated the share of families with school-age children who lived within range of different types of schools. Researchers found that 93% of Michigan families reside within five miles of at least one conventional district elementary school. By that same measure, 83% of Michigan families live close to a private elementary school, 72% to an elementary school in a different district and 62% to a public charter elementary school.⁷ Yet living within close range of a school may not mean access to a safe environment, an academically enriching program or the best opportunity for a child to succeed.

Michigan school districts and other public school operators are not mandated by state law to provide transportation to students, except for ensuring that students with disabilities have specialized transportation services.⁸ A local school board can decide whether to offer transportation to each grade configuration — elementary, middle or high school — or to all students, but must do so on an equal opportunity basis. That means, for example, a district that offers busing to elementary and middle schools must make the service available to all resident students who attend one of those schools or who attend "the nearest state approved nonpublic school" within district boundaries.*

Virtually all of the state's conventional K-12 school districts bus students to and from school within the boundaries of their districts. More than a quarter of districts contract out with private providers to bus students back and forth.⁹ Schools that operate bus services are required to undergo annual inspections. Records from these inspections indicate that about one-third of Michigan charter schools also provide transportation.¹⁰

A little over half of U.S. students are transported to public school by yellow bus or other publicly funded means.¹¹ To the extent Michigan mirrors national trends, a sizable number of young people walk, bike or are driven to school by parents or other adult caregivers. Nevertheless, public schools in Michigan on average spend about 4% of their operating budgets on transporting students to and from school, more than \$620 million in 2018.¹² Including transportation services provided by intermediate school districts, the total rises to \$750 million. Michigan's spending on student transportation has consistently hovered around \$500 per pupil, adjusted for inflation, for at least the past 15 years.¹³

* MCL § 380.1321. Article VIII, § 2 of the Michigan Constitution states, "The legislature may provide for the transportation of students to and from any school."

Intersection of Choice and Transportation

The effect of available transportation on educational choice has only begun to be studied carefully in recent years. Perhaps the earliest analysis came in 2009, when researchers for the Center on Reinventing Public Education surveyed low- and middle-income parents in Denver and Washington, D.C. — two large cities with lots of school choice options. The study noted a key finding:

Parents who were not able to choose the school they preferred due to transportation challenges reported being dissatisfied with the school in which they felt they had to enroll their child. [...] These findings suggest that transportation barriers have an impact on the degree of satisfaction with the school choice made by parents.¹⁴

Parents in these two cities who cited transportation as an important factor in their decision were also less likely to be satisfied where their children ended up in school. For most, the barrier preventing them from accessing a preferred school was related to distance or convenience, though some also were concerned about dangers on the route to and from school. Lower-income families were disproportionately hindered by transportation challenges, suggesting that making transportation more accessible can make school choice programs and options more equitable.¹⁵

More recent research sheds additional light on the impacts of combining robust systems of educational choice with useful transportation options. For instance, recent research shows that Denver ninth-graders who travel the farthest outside their assigned school zone to exercise choice are more likely to attend schools with fewer discipline issues, more advanced course offerings and better academic outcomes.¹⁶ Similarly, other research finds that New York City elementary students tend to use choice to enroll in better-performing schools, but the effect is significantly greater for students who take the school bus or public transit to attend a school of their choice.¹⁷

Despite the benefits of attending a higher quality school, traveling a greater distance to reach that school may entail some costs. This is highlighted in two separate studies of cities where students can use public transit at no charge. In Washington, D.C., researchers found that students with longer commutes spent more time absent from school.¹⁸ Similarly, researchers discovered in Baltimore that students who had to commute through more dangerous areas were more likely to be absent than their peers.¹⁹ The study from the nation's capital further found that a greater distance to travel was associated with more frequent transfers to other schools but had no overall impact on achievement test scores.²⁰

In a 2018 Mackinac Center survey, 15% of nearly 950 Michigan parents whose children attended brick-and-mortar charter schools expressed dissatisfaction with their transportation choices. Also, of the more than 200 parents who said their child was not enrolled in their first-choice school, one in six cited "transportation challenges" as the primary reason. Smaller percentages cited transportation as the primary way their charter school could improve or the main reason they were contemplating a switch to a different school.²¹

Less is known about the relevant views of Michigan parents who participate in interdistrict school choice. While districts receiving students through the Schools of Choice program are required to notify parents of their transportation options, they are under no legal obligation to transport children who live outside their boundaries.²² The precise number of SOC districts that do offer a ride to incoming students is unknown, but likely small.

In 2017, the Mackinac Center surveyed the SOC policies of 168 districts serving 60% of the state's public school students and most of its major population centers. Of the 161 districts that accepted student transfers, only 25 had policies providing some kind of transportation option to nonresident students. Usually, these transportation offerings were limited, such as merely allowing these students to board at an existing stop on the bus route in the receiving school's district and only offering such options when space was available.²³

Detroit: Urban Context

The frustration of being surrounded by different schooling options but with limited means to reach those opportunities is most profoundly seen in the state's largest city. Detroit is the locus of educational choice activity in Michigan. According to data from the Michigan Department of Education, about 60,000 of the city's 108,000 school-aged children opt out of attending the assigned district and enroll in a public charter school, neighboring district, or, to a lesser extent, one of the remaining private schools left in the city. The demand for options may be even greater than what the current variety of schools suggest, because a lack of reliable transportation may prevent some parents from actively seeking out different schools than the one they are assigned based on where they live.

The challenges related to school transportation have been closely studied in the Motor City. Not including students who need special education services, the Detroit Public Schools Community District offers yellow bus transportation strictly to assigned schools based on how far away students live — it is provided for students in grades K-8 who live more than three-quarters of a mile away and for high schoolers who live more than one-and-a-half miles away.²⁴ These services are provided at a per-pupil cost that is more than 50% higher than the average Michigan school district. A 2017 Urban Institute survey found that 65% of Detroit district and charter school families drive their children to school, compared to only 20% who make use of a yellow bus service and even fewer whose children walk (8%) or take public transit (6%).²⁵

Though most of the city's students have selected a school outside their residential district assignment, best estimates indicate that most also live within a 20-minute drive of the school they attend. Elementary students and those who are white or Asian are more likely to have a shorter commute than are older students or those who are African American or Hispanic.²⁶ Not surprisingly, Detroit residents who attend a conventional school district outside the city tend to travel farther than those who enroll in a public charter school, which might be located within the city limits.²⁷

According to a 2014 Center for Reinventing Public Education survey, nearly 30% of Detroit parents said that barriers to transportation made exercising choice significantly harder.²⁸ Providing sustainable school transportation support could serve as part of a solution to help underserved students and families get access to better educational opportunities. Based on research from the Urban Institute, the average Detroit family who crosses district boundaries or opts for a charter selects a higher quality school than what is closest to them, as measured by state assessments of school performance.²⁹ If these options were made available through affordable and reliable transportation to a larger number of families, the educational benefits for students could be significant.

A recent attempt has been made to improve access to school transportation within Detroit. In 2018, a partnership between the city government, school district and the Skillman Foundation — a private, nonprofit charitable organization — launched the GOAL Line initiative. It created an 11-mile bus loop with stops at six district and four charter schools in northwest Detroit, serving about 150 students. A small survey of participating parents found that most do not use the bus route for commuting to a school of choice, but rather to transport their kids to after-school programs. Only a few respondents indicated that the availability of the bus line persuaded them to keep their child in a Detroit school rather than enrolling them in a nearby district, which was one of its backers' stated objectives. In July 2019, city officials announced the loop would continue and expand to four additional northwest Detroit schools in the following school year.³⁰

Beyond Michigan: Advances in School Transportation

The GOAL Line initiative somewhat mirrors Denver's Success Express system, first launched in 2011 to help provide students access to different district and charter schools in the growing northeast part of Colorado's largest city. While using the standard yellow buses, the system operates differently than the traditional staggered routes to schools with different start times. Instead, like a public transit system, Success Express buses run the circuit of locations multiple times in both the morning and the afternoon.

This transportation system, designed to give families added flexibility in accessing more educational options, has been associated with a slight increase in school attendance rates.³¹ Further, despite the need to add extra trained staff to supervise students of widely mixed ages on the buses, Denver Public Schools made transportation services available to more students at a lower per-student cost during the program's first few years of operation.³²

Student-Based Transportation Funding

Policymakers in other parts of the nation, and the world, have created programs to fill the transportation gaps so students can get more equitable access to educational opportunities. In some cases, this includes providing funds to families or other private transportation operators. Florida's nonprofit organization Step Up for Students not only grants scholarships for thousands of low-income students to pay for private school tuition, it also administers a transportation scholarship that helps families pay for a child to travel to a public school outside the county where

they live. These scholarships are financed by donors who receive a tax credit equal to the amount they donate. However, the transportation scholarship is only used by a small number of students.*

One can also look overseas for examples of innovative approaches to school transportation. Two major eastern Australian states operate or contract for bus services in densely populated urban centers, but use a more student-based approach to suburban and rural school transportation funding. Through its School Transport Assistance Scheme, the Queensland government underwrites expenses for public transit to school via bus, train or ferry.³³ The School Student Transport Scheme in New South Wales similarly offers free or discounted travel for elementary and secondary students through partnerships with regional bus and rail services.³⁴

Public funds in Australia can also help pay for privately arranged transportation, including to help parents who must drive more than a minimum distance to a school or a transit pickup point. Queensland's "conveyance allowance" is limited to a formula based on the distance from a student's primary residence to the nearest school a child could attend.³⁵ Through the School Drive Subsidy, the New South Wales government, one time each semester, partially reimburses eligible parents who transport their children to school based on a flat-rate distance fee.³⁶

Student Mobility Scholarships: Concept and Law

The operation and funding of school transportation systems heavily depend on local geography and available means of travel. The systems used in eastern Australia cannot be cut and pasted into Michigan's context. Still, the state could borrow some of these ideas and use flexible strategies to serve the distinct mobility needs of students. Student Mobility Scholarships could extend the ability of underserved students to access schools that were previously out of reach.

The concept is relatively simple, if somewhat innovative: A discrete amount of state funding would be individually set aside on behalf of participating students for restricted use to access transportation to and from school. Key components of the policy are outlined below.

Student Eligibility

Student Mobility Scholarships would be limited to students from low-income families. Preference would be given to students eligible for federally subsidized school lunches.[†] The distance from the student's home to the school would have to be at least one-and-a-half miles, the distance at which districts are not required to transport resident pupils.³⁷

* During the 2018-19 school year, 32 students received a \$750 transportation scholarship, an increase in usage from previous years. Patrick Gibbons, Step Up for Students, email correspondence with author, July 1, 2019; Ron Matus and Jon East, Step Up for Students, telephone correspondence with author, March 23, 2016.

† For the 2019-20 school year, a student from a family of four with an annual income of \$33,475 or less was eligible for a fully subsidized lunch, and a student from a family of four with an annual income between \$33,475 and \$47,638 was eligible for a partially subsidized lunch through the federal government. "Child Nutrition Programs: Income Eligibility Guidelines" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, March 20, 2019), <https://perma.cc/88U5-348G>.

Schools could advertise the opportunity to families, first as a benefit to district residents who wish to attend a school outside their assigned zone. In addition, districts that receive students through Schools of Choice, as well as charter and private schools, could notify families as part of the application process. Once enrolled in the school, a family could submit an application to the state agency designated to administer the program: the Michigan Department of Treasury.

Transportation Options

The availability of Student Mobility Scholarships would expand the range of services and providers for transporting students to school beyond what state law currently requires. School districts and charter schools could receive funding from families who qualify for these scholarships if they provide these families with the transportation services they need, and this might encourage them to provide additional bus routes, or even operate smaller vehicles to transport students, especially in less densely populated areas. Current law prohibits using a vehicle with a manufacturer's rated seating capacity of 11 or greater, except for the standard yellow bus, to carry students to school.³⁸ A change in statute would give districts and charters greater flexibility to use larger passenger vans as a means to transport eligible students.

Student Mobility Scholarship recipients could direct funds to other providers as well, including public transit systems or state-approved ridesharing services. The most popular ridesharing services — Uber and Lyft — operate in a way that restricts on-demand access for users under age 18. This may complicate their ability to participate without the presence of an adult chaperone.

However, a couple of fast-growing companies that operate in other states have been billed as ridesharing for kids. HopSkipDrive and Zum have secured appropriate insurance policies and added parent communication protocols that enable their drivers to transport unaccompanied minors. These companies are based in different parts of California, but are active in places like Colorado, Illinois, Texas and Virginia, and continue to expand. While neither currently operates in Michigan, they have experience partnering with schools and other government agencies to help get children places where they need to go.³⁹ To ensure a sufficient supply of drivers, parents could apply to work with a ridesharing service, providing opportunity for underserved families to gain additional income.

While ridesharing has grown in general familiarity and usage in recent years, a significant disparity still exists by geographic setting. Rural residents are dramatically less likely than their urban-dwelling counterparts to regularly use, or to have ever used, such a service. This is true largely because ridesharing services are less likely to be readily available in rural areas.⁴⁰ As a result, the range of Student Mobility Scholarship provider options would be limited in some regions, though the program could ultimately serve students in most parts of the state.

Funding Mechanism

A limited-use, digital debit account could be set up in the name of each participating student, with parents given the option of receiving a physical debit card to complete purchases. The Michigan Department of Treasury could deposit funds into each eligible account by Aug. 1 each year. The annual funding could be assigned in equal amounts to each student, or it could be distributed on a per-mile basis, with an individual cap set to ensure more students have access to scholarships.

As the student uses transportation services to attend school, money from the debit account would pay qualified providers, up to a capped annual amount. In the case of ridesharing, functioning apps could be programmed to receive scholarship funds directly and limit their usage to predetermined routes to and from school. This might necessitate the development of special funding arrangements, including prepaid weekly or monthly subscription services that would reduce the hassle of making individual payments and could include a discounted rate based on volume of use. Parents and school staff would be able to monitor the ride usage and account balance.

Expanding access to school transportation through Student Mobility Scholarships would create multiple benefits:

- **Increase equitable access to educational options that may be out of reach for students with lesser means.**
It may not be economical for a school to pay for a full-scale busing option for the benefit of just a few students, especially if those students need to commute a longer-than-normal distance to the school. But a small amount of extra aid may underwrite the use of smaller school vehicles, public transit or ridesharing service for these students.
- **Put parents in charge and give some an extra earning opportunity.**
More affluent parents have long been able to take control of how their child gets to school. Mobility scholarships would make that same option available to parents with more limited financial means. For a few parents, the opportunity to become a ridesharing operator could provide an additional benefit.
- **Enable public- and private-sector operators to compete fairly, encouraging greater efficiency and innovation.**
Ridesharing would not necessarily be the only additional option for transporting students. School districts, charter operators and public transit systems could get more business by providing higher quality service to eligible families with distinct transportation needs.

A Pilot Program

While Student Mobility Scholarships ultimately could benefit families throughout Michigan, the state Legislature should consider authorizing a pilot program targeted to a specific city or part of a larger city. This would improve the chances of effective implementation and make it possible to test the effects at a reasonable scale. Within the pilot region, a limited number of scholarships could be made available.

Based on the number of students, schools and potential drivers, a region encompassing part of the city of Detroit could serve as a prime area for a student transportation scholarship pilot. But it may make more sense to pilot a program in a smaller urban setting, where demand for school choice is similar to Detroit, such as Flint or Saginaw. The ability to study the program's effectiveness could be enhanced by also making it available in a variety of locales, including select rural and suburban areas. For the same purpose, the program should use a lottery process to randomize the selection of scholarship recipients from the pool of applicants.

Piloting a user-focused funding mechanism to provide transportation as a public service has some precedent in the state. More than a decade ago, the Michigan Developmental Disabilities Council oversaw a transportation voucher initiative that increased mobility for a vulnerable population. The program reportedly helped hundreds of disabled riders better access job opportunities and medical appointments, as well as perform errands and volunteer activities.⁴¹

Challenges in keeping this program going revolved around finding enough vehicles that could serve people in wheelchairs and encouraging participants to make full use of their opportunities to travel. As the Great Recession hit, county government partners pulled back from funding the program. It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of this program, but no serious problems were reported.⁴²

Pilot Program Funding

The cost of a pilot program can first be estimated on a per-student basis, using projected ridesharing rates in different cities. While each student's travel needs and situation differ, the annual per-student cost for full-time use could reasonably be estimated to be \$1,400 per student. That would pay for four students sharing two five-mile trips, to and from campus, in a larger rideshare vehicle for 180 days.* Operating the program in Detroit, where public transit options are more prevalent, would likely reduce the average cost where some of these services are partially subsidized by other taxpayers.[†] Prorated funding could be provided in cases where work schedules limit parents' ability to drive their children only either to or from school, or only on certain days of the week. The availability of smaller accounts for part-time usage could enable more students to be served.

The core of funding should come through direct legislative appropriation. The relatively modest cost of a pilot program could easily be financed within existing revenue streams. Mobility scholarships serving nearly 700 students in the first year could be paid for with an annual legislative appropriation of just \$1 million. Most of those funds would directly serve the school transportation needs of low-income families. No more than 10% of state dollars should pay for indirect expenses, including the Michigan Department of Treasury's management and oversight.

* Costs are based on the online ridesharing fare estimator Ride Guru, capturing UberXL and LyftPlus rates for travel from multiple different low-income housing complexes to an area school, most of which received high marks on the Mackinac Center's Michigan Public Elementary and Middle School Context and Performance Database, available here: <https://www.mackinac.org/depts/epi/performance.aspx?report=3>. Areas investigated include Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing and Saginaw. The estimates do not allow for possible discounts that could be offered for extended terms of service.

† For example, though its reach is limited, an annual pass on the Detroit Q-Line can be purchased for \$285, as of March 2019. For more information, see <https://qlinedetroit.com/>.

Additional funds raised through community philanthropic partnerships could help with advertising and outreach, as well as data collection and reporting to state lawmakers. The share spent on overhead should decrease with a larger appropriation. If the total usage of scholarship funds is less than the legislative appropriation in a given fiscal year, the difference could be refunded to the state treasury and possibly earmarked for future Student Mobility Scholarships.

The state could also authorize a nonprofit organization to help supplement funding if program dollars are insufficient to meet low-income families' demand for the service. To expand participation, the state could provide a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for donations to this organization, which could then use these donations to fund more transportation scholarships. This tax credit could be capped either as a percentage of a taxpayer's total liability or a total amount of donations for a given fiscal year. Unused funds within a designated student's account would first be recaptured by the scholarship-granting organization to be used toward future Student Mobility Scholarships.

A potential future funding source to expand the limited geographic scope of a pilot program could come through Education Freedom Scholarships. Legislation introduced in the U.S. Congress in 2019 would set up a \$5 billion pool of federal tax credits for donations made to state-approved scholarship organizations. If Michigan opted to participate, the state would determine both the eligibility of student recipients and the qualifying purposes for the funds. Student Mobility Scholarships could be approved as one among many possible uses for families.⁴³

Conclusion

Hundreds of thousands of Michigan students, mostly from low-income families, currently opt into a public charter or district school outside their zone of residence. Families have voted with their feet to find better learning options for their children. A significant share of them, likely thousands, say they would choose something else if transportation were not an obstacle.

And that does not include those who may have stayed in their resident districts because they couldn't afford or imagine how to leave. There are a variety of challenges that these families face in enrolling their children in the best school of their choosing, but transportation consistently ranks as one of the most significant ones. Whatever the cause may be, a focus on the needs of students and the dignity of families to choose what works best for them can create an empowering partnership that helps to put these obstacles in the rear-view mirror.

Starting in a targeted area of need, and ultimately expanding across the state, a system of Student Mobility Scholarships represents one small way to help close the education opportunity gap. It's a fitting approach for the state with a rich history as an automotive industry pioneer. Michigan should drive this promising and innovative initiative forward.

Endnotes

- 1 Ben DeGrow, “Accessing Better Detroit Schools Out of Reach for Some” (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Oct. 31, 2018), <https://perma.cc/F7Z5-CCYF>.
- 2 “Pupil Membership History” (Michigan Senate Fiscal Agency, Jan. 14, 2019), <https://perma.cc/YT52-VJPA>.
- 3 Author’s calculations based on data from the Michigan Department of Education.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Joshua Cowen, Benjamin Creed and Venessa Keesler, “Dynamic Participation in Inter-District Open Enrollment: Evidence from Michigan 2005-2013” (The Education Policy Center at Michigan State University, July 2015), 9–11, <https://perma.cc/4SBG-LGZY>.
- 6 Mich Const, Art. VIII, § 2.
- 7 Matthew M. Chingos and Kristin Blagg, “Who Could Benefit From School Choice? Mapping Access to Public and Private Schools,” *Education Next* (April 3, 2017): 1–11, <https://perma.cc/TD44-AM6P>.
- 8 MCL § 380.1756; Linda Forward, “Requirement and Funding for Specialized Transportation Services” (Michigan Department of Education, July 23, 2015), <https://perma.cc/Z3RM-2CSW>.
- 9 James M. Hohman and Chase Slasinski, “Michigan School Privatization Survey 2018” (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Oct. 18, 2018), <https://perma.cc/FG3Q-3RBH>.
- 10 Author’s calculations based on “School Bus Inspection Report for School Year 2017/2018” (Michigan State Police, 2018), <https://perma.cc/4X4H-JCGW>.
- 11 “Table 236.90: Students Transported at Public Expense and Current Expenditures for Transportation: Selected Years, 1929-30 through 2014-15,” in *Digest of Education Statistics: 2017* (U.S. Department of Education, 2018), <https://perma.cc/5LN4-ET4X>.
- 12 Author’s calculations based on data from the National Public Education Financial Survey published by the U.S. Department of Education.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Paul Teske, Jody Fitzpatrick and Tracey O’Brien, “Drivers of Choice: Parents, Transportation, and School Choice” (Center on Reinventing Public Education, July 2009), 19, <https://perma.cc/C5V3-3NBY>.
- 15 Ibid., 19, 25–26.
- 16 Patrick Denice and Betheny Gross, “Going the Distance: Understand the Benefits of a Long Commute to School” (Urban Institute, Oct. 2018), 1, <https://perma.cc/A349-AUDJ>.
- 17 Sarah A. Cordes and Amy Ellen Schwartz, “Does Pupil Transportation Close the School Quality Gap?: Evidence from New York City” (Urban Institute, Oct. 2018), 1–2, <https://perma.cc/MDE9-XP5P>.
- 18 Kristin Blagg, Victoria Rosenboom and Matthew M. Chingos, “The Extra Mile: Time to School and Student Outcomes in Washington, DC” (Urban Institute, Sept. 2018), <https://perma.cc/8FEM-STDL>.
- 19 Andrew Myers, “Mapping the Connection Between Public Transportation and School Absenteeism” (Johns Hopkins University School of Education, May 15, 2019), <https://perma.cc/U8TS-XXYW>.
- 20 Betheny Gross, “Going the Extra Mile for School Choice,” *Education Next* 19, no. 4 (2019), <https://perma.cc/8NCT-JG5A>.
- 21 “Choices & Voices” (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Sept. 6, 2018), <https://perma.cc/GEN8-W3UJ>.
- 22 “Schools of Choice Transportation Considerations” (Michigan Department of Education, Feb. 7, 2019), <https://perma.cc/X3WZ-2G35>.

Endnotes (cont.)

- 23 Ben DeGrow, “A Survey of Michigan Parents Who Use School Choice” (Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Sept. 17, 2017), <https://perma.cc/DFV3-M3DF>.
- 24 “Transportation” (Detroit Public Schools Community District), <https://perma.cc/C3PX-KCCN>.
- 25 “The Road to School: How Far Students Travel to School in the Choice-Rich Cities of Denver, Detroit, New Orleans, New York City, and Washington, DC” (Urban Institute, March 2018), 19, <https://perma.cc/AVB6-3KZ5>.
- 26 Joshua Cowen et al., “Motor City Miles: Student Travel to Schools in and around Detroit” (Urban Institute, Oct. 2018), 29, <https://perma.cc/TPU7-BEXT>.
- 27 Ibid., 6, 20.
- 28 Ashley Jochim et al., “How Parents Experience Public School Choice” (Center for Reinventing Public Education, Dec. 2014), 20–21, <https://perma.cc/ZZ3Z-M9ZK>.
- 29 Joshua Cowen et al., “Motor City Miles: Student Travel to Schools in and around Detroit” (Urban Institute, Oct. 2018), 30, <https://perma.cc/TPU7-BEXT>.
- 30 Jennifer Chambers, “No Evidence yet Bus Loop Enticing Students to Return to Detroit Schools,” *The Detroit News*, Jan. 15, 2019, <https://perma.cc/PS8L-HCZY>; Koby Levin, “Mayor Duggan Launched a Bus Route to Draw Students Back to Detroit Schools. Is It Working?” (Chalkbeat, March 21, 2019), <https://perma.cc/VZV3-USDR>; Jennifer Chambers, “Detroit Transit Loop Expands List of Schools, Programs,” *The Detroit News*, July 12, 2019, <https://perma.cc/N4HJ-RJNU>.
- 31 Todd Ely and Paul Teske, “Success Express: Transportation Innovation in Denver Public Schools” (Center for Education Policy Analysis, Feb. 2014), 18–22, <https://perma.cc/CPA2-DR2V>.
- 32 Ibid., 15–17.
- 33 “School Transport Assistance Scheme” (The State of Queensland, 2019), <https://perma.cc/C9HZ-DXJR>.
- 34 “About the School Student Transport Scheme” (New South Wales Government, 2016), <https://perma.cc/R3XQ-KKA7>.
- 35 “School Transport Assistance Scheme” (Queensland Government, Feb. 2019), <https://perma.cc/8VJQ-C9EZ>.
- 36 “School Drive Subsidy” (New South Wales Government, 2016), <https://perma.cc/U4M7-83U2>.
- 37 MCL § 380.1321.
- 38 MCL § 257.1810.
- 39 For more information, see: Lora Kolodny, “This Ride-Hailing Service Will Pick up Your Kids Where School Buses Don’t Go” (CNBC, Nov. 21, 2017), <https://perma.cc/D2TE-VRX5>.
- 40 For more information, see: Jingjing Jiang, “More Americans Are Using Ride-Hailing Apps” (Pew Research Center, Jan. 4, 2019), <https://perma.cc/E5SJ-ND2Z>.
- 41 Glenn Ashley, “Transportation Voucher Program Basics” (Michigan Developmental Disabilities Council), <https://perma.cc/CL5J-SBXL>.
- 42 “Transportation Voucher Replication Handbook” (Michigan Developmental Disabilities Council, Oct. 2008), 32–33, <https://perma.cc/9M9R-2ZDL>.
- 43 For more information, see: “Fast Facts: Education Freedom Scholarships” (U.S. Department of Education, Feb. 28, 2019), <https://perma.cc/UZ2T-GELN>.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. Clifford W. Taylor, Chairman

*Retired Chief Justice
Michigan Supreme Court*

Joseph G. Lehman

*President
Mackinac Center for Public Policy*

Jim Barrett

*Retired President and CEO
Michigan Chamber of Commerce*

Daniel J. Graf

*Chief Investment Officer
Amerisure Mutual Holdings, Inc.*

Dulce M. Fuller

*Owner
Woodward and Maple*

Richard G. Haworth

*Chairman Emeritus
Haworth, Inc.*

Kent B. Herrick

*President and CEO
Thermogy*

J.C. Huizenga

*President
Westwater Group*

Edward C. Levy Jr.

*President
Edw. C. Levy Co.*

Rodney M. Lockwood Jr.

*President
Lockwood Construction Co., Inc.*

Joseph P. Maguire

*President and CEO
Wolverine Development Corp.*

Richard D. McLellan

*Attorney
McLellan Law Offices*

D. Joseph Olson

*Retired Senior Vice President
and General Counsel
Amerisure Companies*

BOARD OF SCHOLARS

Dr. Donald Alexander
Western Michigan University

Dr. Thomas Bertonneau
SUNY-Oswego

Dr. Brad Birzer
Hillsdale College

Dr. Peter Boettke
George Mason University

Dr. Theodore Bolema
Wichita State University

Dr. Alex Cartwright
Ferris State University

Dr. Michael Clark
Hillsdale College

Matthew Coffey
Central Michigan University

Dr. Dan Crane
University of Michigan Law School

Shikha Dalmia
Reason Foundation

Dr. Chris Douglas
University of Michigan-Flint

Dr. Jefferson Edgens
University of Wyoming

Dr. Ross Emmett
Arizona State University

Dr. Sarah Estelle
Hope College

Dr. Hugo Eyzaguirre
Northern Michigan University

Dr. Tawni Ferrarini
Northern Michigan University

Dr. Burton Folsom
Hillsdale College (ret.)

John Grether
Northwood University

Dr. David Hebert
Aquinas College

Thomas A. Hemphill
University of Michigan-Flint

Dr. Michael Hicks
Ball State University

Dr. Ormand Hook
Mecosta-Osceola ISD

Prof. Harry Hutchison
George Mason University School of Law

Dr. David Janda
Institute for Preventative Sports Medicine

Annette Kirk
Russell Kirk Center

David Littmann
Mackinac Center for Public Policy

Dr. Dale Matchek
Northwood University

Charles Meiser
Lake Superior State University (ret.)

Dr. Glenn Moots
Northwood University

Dr. George Nastas III
Marketing Consultants

Dr. Todd Nesbit
Ball State University

Dr. John Pafford
Northwood University (ret.)

Dr. Mark Perry
University of Michigan-Flint

Lawrence W. Reed
Foundation for Economic Education

Gregory Rehmke
Economic Thinking

Dr. Steve Safranek
Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc.

Dr. Howard Schwartz
Oakland University

Dr. Martha Seger
Federal Reserve Board (ret.)

James Sheehan
SunTrust Robinson Humphrey

Rev. Robert Sirico
Acton Institute

Dr. Bradley Smith
Capital University Law School

Dr. Chris Surprenant
University of New Orleans

Dr. Jason Taylor
Central Michigan University

Dr. John Taylor
Wayne State University

Dr. Richard K. Vedder
Ohio University

Prof. Harry Veryser Jr.
University of Detroit Mercy

John Walter Jr.
Dow Corning Corporation (ret.)

Mike Winther
Institute for Principle Studies

Dr. Gary Wolfram
Hillsdale College



Ben DeGrow is the Mackinac Center's education policy director. DeGrow joined the Center in 2015 after a long stint at Colorado's Independence Institute, where he provided expert analysis on school choice, school finance, collective bargaining and education employment policies. He authored numerous policy reports and opinion-editorials for various newspapers and other publications, and regularly appeared on radio and television and before legislative committees.



The Mackinac Center for Public Policy is dedicated to improving the understanding of economic and political principles among citizens, public officials, policymakers and opinion leaders. The Center has emerged as one of the largest and most prolific of the more than 50 state-based free-market "think tanks" in America. Additional information about the Mackinac Center and its publications can be found at www.mackinac.org.

Additional copies of this report are available for order from the Mackinac Center.

For more information, call 989-631-0900, or see our website, www.mackinac.org.